

REMARKS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 9-11, 17-19, 33-35, 59-61 and 64-75 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, the Examiner objects to the recital in the independent claims of “wherein an absolute value of the second reverse bias voltage is higher than an absolute value of the first reverse bias voltage.” The Examiner believes that this requires a numerical value of these voltages to be disclosed in the specification.

While Applicants disagree, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended independent Claims 9, 17, 33, 64, 68 and 72 to recite “wherein ~~an absolute value~~ magnitude of the second reverse bias voltage is higher than ~~an absolute value~~ magnitude of the first reverse bias voltage.” It is respectfully submitted that this feature is supported by the application as filed.

In particular, page 6, lns. 5-8 state that the present invention is directed to “a method of fabricating and/or repairing a light emitting device by gradually changing a voltage applied to an EL element from a first voltage to a second voltage, characterized in that the first voltage and the second voltage are reverse bias voltages of different levels.” Fig. 1B shows the different levels (see e.g. pages 10-11 in the specification; such as where it states that the reverse bias voltage is gradually increased). As shown in the marked-up copy (for illustrative purposes only) of Fig. 1B, the magnitude of the second reverse bias voltage is clearly higher or greater than the magnitude of the first reverse bias voltage. It is respectfully submitted that the use of the term

“magnitude” does not require numerical values and that one skilled in the art would clearly understand this language from the drawings and specification.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been overcome, and it is requested that the rejection now be withdrawn.

Allowability of Claims

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that should Applicants overcome the §112 first paragraph rejection with the objected to limitation, the claims may be allowed as the prior art does not teach the objected to limitation (alternatively, if the limitation was canceled, then a final rejection may be issued). As Applicants have found a way to claim this limitation in an acceptable manner under §112, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art still does not disclose the amended limitation, and the claims are patentable over the prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the claims now be allowed.


Conclusion

For at least the above-stated reasons, the claims of the present application are in an allowable condition and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, MCFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street - #2850
Chicago, IL 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568